Efrat Solomon

Chapter 13 Test

SAQ

Set 2:

In your response, be sure to address all parts of the questions. Use complete sentences; and outline or bulleted list alone is not acceptable.

Answer (a), (b), and (c).

(a) Briefly describe the concept of Manifest Destiny.

Manifest Destiny was the belief held by many Americans in the 1800s that the United States was meant by God to expand across the entire North American continent, from the East Coast to the West Coast. Americans who supported this idea believed it was their natural right and divine mission to spread their way of life westward.

(b) Briefly explain ONE specific historical reason that the concept of Manifest Destiny emerged in the 1840s.

One reason Manifest Destiny emerged in the 1840s was that the U.S. population was growing quickly and people needed more land. The eastern part of the country was becoming crowded, and many Americans saw the open lands to the west as an opportunity for a fresh start and new farming land. This hunger for more space helped push the idea that expansion was not just acceptable, but necessary and destined.

(c) Briefly describe ONE specific historical similarity or difference between the concept of Manifest Destiny in the 1840s and the ideas that motivated European colonists to migrate to North America in the 1600s.

One similarity between Manifest Destiny and the motivations of European colonists in the 1600s is that both groups used religion to justify their expansion. Puritan settlers in the 1600s believed God sent them to the New World to build a Christian society, just as Americans in the 1840s believed God wanted them to spread across the continent. In both cases, people used the idea of a divine mission to justify taking land that already belonged to others.

Set 3:

In your response, be sure to address all parts of the questions. Use complete sentences; and outline or bulleted list alone is not acceptable.

Answer (a), (b), and (c).

(a) Briefly describe ONE element of the Compromise of 1850.

One element of the Compromise of 1850 was the Fugitive Slave Act, which required people in free states to help capture and return enslaved people who had escaped to the North. This meant that even people in states where slavery was illegal were legally forced to participate in returning escaped enslaved people to their owners in the South.

(b) Briefly explain one specific historical reason why the United States government agreed to the Compromise of 1850.

One reason the U.S. government agreed to the Compromise of 1850 was that the country was on the verge of falling apart over the issue of slavery. After the Mexican-American War, the United States gained a large amount of new land, and Northern and Southern states were fighting intensely over whether slavery would be allowed in those new territories. Government leaders like Henry Clay pushed for the compromise because they feared that without a deal, the conflict could lead to the breakup of the Union.

(c) Briefly describe ONE key historical similarity or difference between the Compromise of 1850 and the Missouri Compromise.

One similarity between the Compromise of 1850 and the Missouri Compromise is that both were attempts by the government to maintain a balance of power between free states and slave states. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 tried to solve the slavery debate by drawing a geographic line that determined where slavery could and could not exist, just as the Compromise of 1850 tried to settle the same argument by making a series of deals that gave something to both the North and the South. In both cases, the government was trying to delay a larger conflict over slavery rather than actually solving the problem.

Set 4:

A. Briefly explain why ONE of the following options most clearly marks the beginning of the sectional crisis that led to the outbreak of the civil war.

- Northwest Ordinance (1787)
- Missouri Compromise (1820)
- Acquisition of Mexican Territory (1848)

The Acquisition of Mexican Territory in 1848 most clearly marks the beginning of the sectional crisis. Before this, slavery debates existed but compromises had managed to keep the peace. Once the U.S. gained a huge amount of new land from Mexico after the Mexican-American War, the question of whether slavery would spread into these new territories became impossible to avoid. This created a direct conflict between the North and South that could not be settled the same way older disputes had been.

B. Provide an example of an event or development to support your explanation.

The Wilmot Proviso of 1846 shows this well. David Wilmot proposed banning slavery from any land gained from Mexico. It passed in the House but failed in the Senate, splitting Congress almost entirely along North-South lines. This showed that the new territory was going to force a serious, ongoing fight over slavery that previous compromises could not fix.

C. Briefly explain why one the other options is not useful to mark the beginning of the sectional crisis.

The Missouri Compromise of 1820 is not the useful to mark the beginning of the sectional crisis because it actually resolved the sectional tension at the time rather than starting a crisis. Congress drew a line at 36-30' and both sides accepted it. The North and South were able to reach an agreement and move on. A true beginning of the sectional crisis should be a point where tensions could no longer be managed, and the Missouri Compromise did the opposite by calming things down.